## EXHIBIT 498

```
UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
 1
           FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF OHIO
 2
 3
                    EASTERN DIVISION
 4
 5
     IN RE: NATIONAL PRESCRIPTION
    OPIATE LITIGATION
                                    Case No.
 6
 7
                                     1:17-MD-2804
    APPLIES TO ALL CASES
                                    Hon. Dan A.
 8
 9
                                     Polster
    Case No. 1:17-MD-2804
10
11
                    January 17, 2019
12
13
       HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL - SUBJECT TO FURTHER
14
                 CONFIDENTIALITY REVIEW
15
                 Videotaped deposition of
16
    DOUGLAS BOOTHE, held at 250 Hudson Street,
    New York, New York, commencing at 9:00 a.m.,
17
    on the above date, before Marie Foley, a
18
19
    Registered Merit Reporter, Certified
    Realtime Reporter and Notary Public.
20
21
22
              GOLKOW LITIGATION SERVICES, INC.
23
             877.370.3377 ph | 917.591.5672 fax
24
                     Deps@golkow.com
```

- 1 was at the pharmacy level or at the
- wholesale level, ended up going somewhere
- 3 else than where it was ended to go, which
- 4 would be outside or after the chain of
- 5 custody that we had for the product, that
- 6 would be my understanding of diversion.
- 7 Q. So, what was your understanding
- 8 of Actavis's responsibilities under the
- 9 law with respect to preventing diversion
- 10 of opioids?
- MS. WELCH: Objection to form.
- MR. DIAMANTATOS: Objection to
- form; foundation.
- MS. WELCH: Objection to the
- extent it calls for a legal
- 16 conclusion.
- MR. DIAMANTATOS: Asked and
- answered.
- 19 BY MS. BAIG:
- Q. Using your definition of
- 21 diversion.
- MS. WELCH: Same objections.
- A. Again, I don't think we had
- 24 responsibility for, accountability for

- 1 preventing diversion. We had
- 2 responsibility and accountability for
- 3 making certain that the orders that we
- 4 received were valid from licensed
- 5 pharmacies and were within our suspicious
- 6 order monitoring thresholds as it was
- 7 described earlier then with the Buzzeo
- 8 model or the more statistical model. So
- 9 we -- that was our responsibility.
- 10 Once it goes outside of our
- 11 chain of custody, we have no capability or
- 12 responsibility or accountability to -- or
- 13 at least my understanding, I'm not a
- lawyer, as it relates to diversion. So,
- once we ship a valid order to a wholesaler
- or ship a valid order to a distributor or
- 17 another smaller wholesaler, our chain of
- 18 custody is finished at that point.
- 19 Q. You had an understanding that
- 20 Actavis was required to have a suspicious
- order monitoring program in place,
- 22 correct?
- 23 A. Yes.
- Q. And, did you understand that